

STATE CAPITOL SACRAMENTO 95614 19.43/ 00344156

925 E BIREST SUPERTSO BISTAMENTO 25014 NO. 445/8255

## California Legislature

### Joint Argislative Andit Committee

GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 10500 et al

RICHARD ROBINSON

CHAIRMAN

June 28, 1979

Letter Report 860.2

ALBERT RODDA

PAUL CARPENTER
JOHN NEJEDLY
ROBERT PRESLEY
ASSEMBLYMEN
RICHARD ROBINSON

DANIEL BOATWRIGHT LEPOY GREENE BRUCE NESTANDE

Honorable Carmen Perino, Chairman Joint Committee on Fairs Allocation and Classification 1116 Ninth Street, Room 77 Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Assemblyman Perino:

The Joint Legislative Audit Committee respectfully submits the Auditor General's letter report on vocational education in California.

The auditors are Eugene T. Potter, Supervising Auditor; Ann Arneill; and Mark A. Lowder.

Sincerely,

RICHARD ROBINSON

Assemblyman, 72nd District Chairman, Joint Legislative

Audit Committee

cc: The Honorable Speaker of the Assembly
The Honorable President pro Tempore of the Senate
The Honorable Members of the Senate and the
Assembly of the Legislature of California



925 L STREET SUITE 750 SACRAMENTO 95814 (916) 445-0255

## California Legislature

Joint Legislative Audit Committee

GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 10500 et al

Office of the Auditor General

June 26, 1979

Letter Report 860.2

CHAIRMAN RICHARD ROBINSON

ASSEMBLYMAN
VICE CHAIRMAN
ALBERT RODDA
SENATOR

Honorable Richard Robinson Chairman, and Members of the Joint Legislative Audit Committee State Capitol, Room 4158 Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Mr. Chairman and Members:

In response to a resolution by the Joint Legislative Audit Committee, we have examined some issues pertaining to vocational education in California. This examination was conducted under the authority vested in the Auditor General by Section 10527 of the Government Code.

We reviewed the following issues:

- The sources and uses of funds for vocational education in fiscal year 1977-78
- The allocation formulas for federal vocational education funds used by the State Department of Education (SDE) and the Chancellor's Office of California Community Colleges (CCC)
- SDE's administration of 1978-79 federal program improvement and supportive services funds and the use of the studies and projects they funded.

We addressed the federal vocational education allocation formula in Report No. 860.1, "Distribution of Federal Vocational Education Funds in California." This letter report concerns the remaining two issues and indicates our difficulties in proceeding with a comprehensive study of them at this time.

#### Background

In fiscal year 1977-78, California received over \$44 million in federal vocational education funds under the Vocational Education Act of 1976, a federal categorical funding program for vocational education.\* California, however, does not have a corresponding state categorical program for vocational education. Additional vocational education funding, estimated at \$600 million for 1977-78, is provided by the state apportionment process and by district funds.

Vocational education is primarily delivered through four educational systems: secondary schools, adult schools, community colleges. and regional occupational centers programs (ROC/Ps). Secondary schools offer high school students both specific vocational programs and numerous courses which may or may not be directly linked to the student's immediate occupational preparation. Adult schools, run by the secondary school districts, offer adults a range of vocational courses. The California Community Colleges also sponsor vocational education programs which are open to any high school graduate. ROC/Ps offer skill-related vocational education courses and frequently include employment-based training opportunities. These regional centers serve high school students and may also offer courses for adults.

Insufficient Vocational Education Income and Expenditure Data

Vocational education funding in this State is non-categorical. Because the California School Accounting Manual did not require program accounting for non-categorical programs, reliable data on income and expenditures at the local level are generally unavailable.\*\* Consequently, the sources and uses of vocational education funds for 1977-78 cannot be determined.

<sup>\*</sup>Categorical funds are those apportionments earmarked for a specific program--in this case, vocational education.

<sup>\*\*</sup>This problem may be partially alleviated in the 1978-79 school year by the 1977 Amendments to the School Accounting Manual which require program accounting.

School districts aggregate their average daily attendance (ADA) for most instructional programs, including vocational education, when reporting ADA to the State. Based on this data, the State makes a general apportionment to the districts. As a result, income to vocational education programs generally cannot be isolated. Although the Vocational Education Act of 1976 requires SDE to report vocational education expenditures, delays in data processing have occurred. Fiscal year 1977-78 data will be unavailable until late summer.

Because detailed program accounting for vocational education generally has not existed at the local level, the expenditures reported to SDE are often incomplete. For example, none of the local education agencies (LEAs) we visited charged or pro-rated direct and indirect support costs to vocational education. In one instance, even direct costs were inaccurate because instructional salaries and employee benefits were not charged to programs. These limitations prevent an accurate analysis of the sources and uses of vocational education funds.

SDE Administration of Program Improvement and Supportive Services Funds

Subpart 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1976 is designed to assist states in improving their vocational education programs and in providing supportive services for those programs. federal government will reimburse up to 50 percent of expenses incurred in such activities; state or local sources must fund the remaining expenses. The act specifies the categories in which the funds can be spent. The Joint Policy Council for Vocational Education of the State Board of Education and Board of Governors, California Community Colleges approves the funding levels for these categories. In 1978-79, California received a grant award of approximately \$10.7 million in Subpart 3 funds: \$8.8 million was allotted to LEAs, and \$1.9 million was reserved for state The following table shows the Subpart 3 administration. categories and funds allotted to them as reported by the Department of Education.

# REPORTED ALLOTMENT OF FEDERAL PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FUNDS (FISCAL YEAR 1978-79)

Subpart 3 Category	C	tatewide Combined tivities*	SI	eparate DE/CCC tivities	Di: LEA:	vailable fo stribution s by Alloca Formulas	to	<u>Total</u>
Research	\$	248,100	\$	87,500			\$	335,600
Dissemination	n	152,000						152,000
Exemplary and Innovative	d	200,000		52,000				252,000
Curriculum Developmen	t	167,160		68,000				235,160
Vocational Guidance a Counseling		640,560				1,235,995		1,876,555
Personnel Training		803,440		64,000				867,440
Sex Equity		362,300						362,300
Disadvantage	d	820,620				1,055,935		1,876,555
Handicapped		300,160				638,118		938,278
For Use by Districts in Any Subpart 3 Category**						1,567,800		1,567,800
Subtotal	_3	3,694,340	_:	271,500	_	4,497,848		8,463,688
California Youth Alternatives Project 350,00								
State Administration								1,871,485
Total							\$1	0,685,173

<sup>\*</sup> Funds in these categories are awarded by contracts and grants.

<sup>\*\*</sup> These categories are exceptions: research, exemplary and innovative, and curriculum development.

Various methods were used to distribute these funds: selection among research proposals submitted by LEAs, sole-source grants, and allocation formulas. Approximately \$4 million was awarded by contracts and grants. LEAs submitted proposals which were evaluated by a team of experts. Some sole-source grants were made to individuals and institutions deemed most competent to conduct research in high-priority areas. Another \$4.5 million was disbursed to LEAs using general allocation formulas for vocational education funds. These funds were used principally for vocational guidance and counseling and for personnel training.

Because projects funded in fiscal year 1978-79 are not yet completed, analyzing their effectiveness and the use of their results at this time is not feasible. In fiscal year 1977-78, many projects in the categories of training and guidance and counseling programs reportedly had direct and immediate use. On the other hand, research, exemplary and innovative projects, and curriculum development do not have an immediate use. They require time for dissemination and implementation before they can be evaluated.

This report concludes our efforts to examine these vocational education issues. We are not providing additional information on the uses of vocational education funds because data are generally unavailable.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas W. Hayes

Acting Auditor General

Staff: Eugene T. Potter, Supervising Auditor

Ann Arneill Mark A. Lowder

Pam York, Support Staff

Attachment: Written Response of the Department of Education

1979-80 Budget Item No. 326



#### STATE OF CALIFORNIA

#### DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

STATE EDUCATION BUILDING, 721 CAPITOL MALL, SACRAMENTO 95814  $June \ \ 25 \text{,} \ \ 1979$ 

Mr. Thomas W. Hayes Acting Auditor General 925 L Street, Suite 750 Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Mr. Hayes:

We have received and reviewed the June 20, 1979, draft report from the Office of the Auditor General identified as Letter Report 860.2, Vocational Education in California.

We have no comments to make on the information and findings in the report. We appreciate the opportunity to review the report before its release.

Sincerely,

William D. Whiteneck

Deputy Superintendent for Administration

(916) 445-8950

WDW:elh